

**VILLAGE OF LAKE BLUFF
JOINT PLAN COMMISSION & ZONING BOARD OF APPEALS
REGULAR MEETING**

JUNE 15, 2016

APPROVED MINUTES

1. Call to Order & Roll Call

Chair Kraus called to order the regular meeting of the Joint Plan Commission and Zoning Board of Appeals (PCZBA) of the Village of Lake Bluff on Wednesday, June 15, 2016, at 7:00 p.m. in the Village Hall Board Room (40 E. Center Avenue).

The following members were present:

Members: Sam Badger
Leslie Bishop
David Burns
Mary Collins (arrived late)
Elliot Miller
Gary Peters
Steven Kraus, Chair

Also Present: Peter Friedman, Village Attorney
Drew Irvin, Village Administrator
Jeff Hansen, Village Engineer
Brandon J. Stanick, Assistant to the Village Administrator (A to VA)

2. Non-Agenda Items and Visitors

Chair Kraus stated the PCZBA allocates 15 minutes for those individuals who would like the opportunity to address the PCZBA on any matter not listed on the agenda.

There were no requests to address the PCZBA.

3. A Public Hearing to Consider the Following: i) a Text Amendment to the Village's Zoning Regulations Establishing Regulations for Planned Mixed-Use Developments as a Special Use in the B Residence District (R-4), C Residence District (R-5) and Central Business District (CBD); ii) a Special Use Permit for a Planned Mixed-Use Development to Permit the Construction and Maintenance of a 16 Unit Multi-Family Structure and Related Improvements (Development) at 120 E. Scranton Avenue (former PNC Bank Property); and iii) Any Other Zoning Relief as Required to Construct and Maintain the Development at the Property.

Chair Kraus introduced the agenda item and requested an update from Staff.

A to VA Brandon Stanick announced additional seating was available in the Public Safety Building Community Room with a television for residents to watch the meeting live. Also, arrangements were made for anyone in the Public Safety Building that would like to make a statement during the public hearing portion.

A to VA Stanick reported in May 2016 the Village received a zoning petition from The Roanoke Group (Petitioner) seeking:

- a text amendment to the Village's Zoning Code establishing regulations for Planned Mixed-Use Developments (PMD) as a special use in the B Residence District (R-4), C Residence District (R-5) and the Central Business District (CBD);
- a special use permit for a PMD to permit the construction and maintenance of a 16 unit multi-family structure and related improvements (Development) at 120 E. Scranton Avenue (former PNC Bank property); and
- any other zoning relief as required to construct and maintain the Development at the Property.

A to VA Stanick reported the Petitioner's application seeks approval to construct a planned development on a 0.76 acre (33,000 sq. ft.) parcel in Block Three of the CBD commonly known as the former PNC Bank property. The application proposes a three story, 16 unit multi-family building with the third story set back from the second story building wall and fully-enclosed grade level parking for 32 spaces. The Development also proposes vehicular access off of Oak Avenue and Evanston Avenue with a permeable paver drive along the full length of the north side of the Property. According to the overall site plan, no existing trees will remain. He reviewed the informational materials provided in the packet noting a memorandum from Village Engineer Jeff Hansen dated June 8, 2016 responds to the results of the Petitioner's traffic study (performed by KLOA, Inc.) and stormwater requirements. A chart comparing the Development to the Village's zoning regulations for CBD and the R-4 Residence District is also attached.

A to VA Stanick stated a proposed draft ordinance amending the Village's Zoning Code to establish a process and related regulations for the approval of PMDs prepared by Village Legal Counsel is also provided. Consistent with existing planned development regulations in the Village's Zoning Code, the draft PMD regulations include: i) General Provisions, ii) Procedure, iii) Standards and Conditions, iv) Authority to Modify Regulations, v) Adjustments and Amendments to Approved Final Plans and vi) Application Requirements. A to VA Stanick stated in summary, the draft PMD regulations include a two-phase review process with a required site plan review by the Architectural Board of Review following Final Plan approval considered by the PCZBA. As the PCZBA is aware, traditional use, bulk, space and yard regulations may be relaxed to achieve Village objectives including, but not limited to, creative approaches to mixed-use development of land through the planned development process.

A to VA Stanick stated should the PCZBA want to further consider the Development, it is recommended they consider the Petitioner's responses to the Text Amendment Guiding Principles (to consider the draft PMD regulations), as well as the Standards and Conditions (Section 10-15-3) outlined in the draft PMD regulations to consider conceptual development plan approval. He then reviewed the draft standards and conditions.

Village Attorney Peter Friedman stated the PMD Ordinance is based on the Planned Commercial Development (PCD) regulations adopted at the time the Village approved the Target Retail Center Development. The Village has used the zoning process not only for the Target PCD but also for Planned Residential Developments. This was the basis for the proposed PMD text amendment being considered tonight.

Village Attorney Friedman addressed the comments submitted by PCZBA Member Collins regarding the extent and timing of the ABR review in conjunction with the PCZBA's review of a PMD proposal. Additionally he addressed a comment by Member Collins regarding the

possibility of a super majority vote requirement and noted a super majority vote is only required by the Village Board on a negative recommendation concerning a zoning variation. This is a policy decision for the PCZBA and Village Board, but would be a change in policy for the Village if used in the proposed PMD regulations.

Village Attorney Friedman stated there are numerous standards a PMD must address during the review process. He stated in reviewing the PCD regulations there are numerous provisions regarding how to address impact on neighboring properties. There is a specific provision that was believed to be cumulative and ambiguous in either situation whether the PCZBA wanted to approve or deny a proposed PMD. He stated, because he felt that the provision was ambiguous and unnecessary it wasn't included in the draft PMD ordinance. He stated he chose this action as the Village Attorney, and as a legal matter, felt the ordinance works better without the provision. He stated there are numerous provisions in the draft ordinance that protect the Village's and PCZBA's right to deny a proposed development, if the PCZBA and/or Village Board determine a proposed development adversely impacts neighboring properties. He commented on the standards and conditions in the draft ordinance regarding impact on other property.

Chair Kraus stated the PCZBA received in their packets the input from the community and thanked the public for their comments. Chair Kraus reviewed the public hearing process and protocol for the meeting. He stated the text amendment and special use permit, when considered for a vote, will be voted on independently of one another.

Chair Kraus opened the floor to the PCZBA for questions concerning the materials provided in the packet.

In response to a question from Member Miller, Village Attorney Friedman stated a proposed PMD does not have to be all residential as the text amendment was written to provide flexibility in allowing more than one use. Also, the proposed PMD applies throughout the CBD, R-5 District and R-4 District.

Member Badger stated given the tenor of the proceedings he would prefer the deleted provision concerning the impact that a development may have on other property be put back into the draft ordinance.

Member Bishop stated the document is worded to sound as if anything that does not work with the surrounding neighborhood could be a problem. She asked if the Village could make any improvements to Block Three without going up against the provision regarding noncompliance with the surrounding neighborhood. Village Attorney Friedman stated that would be a judgement call by the PCZBA and Village Board when considering if the proposal meets the applicable standards outlined as part of the PMD text amendment. Village Attorney Friedman stated the special use and PMD process is designed to provide flexibility which allows the Village a lot of discretion.

Chair Kraus administered the oath to those in attendance and opened the public hearing.

Mr. Peter Kyte, representative of The Roanoke Group (Petitioner), introduced the following individuals associated with the project: Mr. Eric Russell (Traffic consultant from KLOA, Inc.), Mr. Robert Hidey (Architect from Robert Hidey Architects) and Mr. Jerry Callahan (Legal

Counsel representing the Petitioner). Mr. Kyte stated they have met with a group of residents to review the proposal before tonight's meeting and received feedback on the proposed plans which will also be reviewed.

Mr. Kyte provided background information on The Roanoke Group. He stated as a result of the vibrant downtown they have been paying close attention to the CBD design process and how it relates to Blocks Two and Three. Mr. Kyte showed a previous proposal submitted earlier this year and expressed his agreement with the sentiment of the community the development did not fit within Lake Bluff. He stated a PMD would allow for residents and Village Officials to provide input on the development as it goes through the review process. Mr. Kyte confirmed The Roanoke Group is not the property owner, but does have a contract with the owner that is contingent on the project being approved.

Mr. Kyte showed a diagram of what could be built as of right based on the current underlying zoning. He showed examples of new construction along the North Shore and commented on the features noting those the transitional buyer is not currently pursuing. Mr. Kyte presented demographic statistics and expressed his belief the future population will not be looking for traditional housing types.

Mr. Kyte stated a traffic study has been conducted and noted there will be no traffic issues associated with the project. Mr. Kyte stated the Petitioner's fiscal impact consultant, Kane, Mekenna & Associates, Inc., anticipates a future net fiscal impact that will increase the base tax. He stated the Development will not negatively impact School District #65. Lastly, Mr. Kyte showed photographs of the existing conditions surrounding the site and neighborhood. He then introduced Robert Heidy of Robert Heidy Architects.

Mr. Heidy noted the intention with the development is to create a residential project that responds to the context of Scranton Avenue. Mr. Heidy showed preliminary sketches of the development for the site. Mr. Heidy showed an aerial of the site. He described the development as having a minimal setback along Scranton Avenue, and the building's façade along Scranton Avenue, as broken up to minimize the massing of the structure. He noted the third story is setback 8'4" (along Scranton) from the second story building wall. He showed an access lane on the north side providing rear loaded access to the garages built at grade. In the previous proposal there was a through lane which we concluded is not necessary and landscape elements will be provided to separate access from the two east and west roads into the site and prevent through traffic through the rear of the development.

Mr. Heidy showed the floor plans consisting of four units on the first floor fronting Scranton Avenue. The second story having eight units and the third story having two penthouse units. He stated trash is enclosed within the parking enclosure and there are exterior stairs that provide egress from the second and third stories. The primary entrances to the building are located around the perimeter of the development and access points to the second and third floors would be through an elevator. He provided information on the open space, positioned mid-block, along Scranton Avenue.

Mr. Heidy stated the second floor consists of four units per building serviced by an elevator corridor. The third floor consist of two penthouse units with a landscaped terrace and three walls

of daylight around the perimeter. The roof plan shows a slopping, hip roof that seeks to reduce the impact of the third story.

Mr. Heidy reviewed the preliminary landscape plan noting the pocket park located mid-block along Scranton Avenue. He showed images of the exterior of the building which is predominately masonry. He showed perspectives of the building elevations from street level along Evanston and Oak Avenues. Mr. Heidy showed a diagram of the third story depicting the third story setback compared to a daylight plane regulation. Mr. Heidy showed the building pop-out projections and noted it helps mitigate the long walls of the facades. Mr. Heidy showed a series of 3D images of the proposed development as well.

Mr. Heidy showed proposed changes to the Scranton Avenue curb face to allow greater streetscape plantings and continue the parallel parking scheme. He showed the landscape features from the rear of the property. Mr. Kyte stated the plan is to install mature maple trees and smaller crabapple trees.

The Petitioner concluded the presentation and Chair Kraus opened the floor for comments from the Commissioners.

Member Badger asked about the impact to stormwater drainage given the amount of impervious surface on the site. Mr. Kyte stated the preliminary stormwater report suggests the use of permeable pavers and wells could be used if there is a need to accommodate drainage. He also noted sewers could be increased in capacity to hold additional stormwater.

Member Burns asked why the landscape feature is mid-block and not designed to take advantage of maintaining the existing Oak tree stand along Evanston Avenue. Mr. Kyte stated it was important to minimize the impact the two structures have along the streetscape and the space in the middle improves the appearance for the neighbors and provides an opportunity to install a pocket park.

Member Miller expressed his concern the proposed units, because of their cost, would not serve a transitional housing type. He stated the proposal does not fill a need for Lake Bluff. The space is smaller, but the cost and taxes will not change. Mr. Kyte expressed his preference to build a less dense development in the CBD. He stated it is not financially feasible to lower the price of the units at this density or move forward without a third story.

Member Burns expressed concern for the transition from this building to the surrounding areas. He inquired about the transitional elements that could be incorporated to make it fit into the community. Mr. Kyte expressed his belief it would be beneficial to separate the two buildings as part of the transition as there are unrelenting long building walls along Blocks One and Two already. He stated the building was designed to look like the front of a house as you transition from the side.

Member Badger expressed concern with the lack of an adequate setback from the Evanston Avenue side. He stated the Planning Principles recommended for adoption by the PCZBA conserve open space because it serves as a transition between residential on the east and commercial on the west. He asked if there was a model with less units that could provide more transition on the east side of the site.

Mr. Heidy stated each of the four parking bays (holds eight cars each) measure 64 ft. in width and have 20 ft. deep parking stalls and 24 ft. drive aisles which is a traditional approach to parking. He stated the building could be reduced and moved westerly, providing more open space on the east; however, there is a need to maintain the proposed parking grid and the only way to do that is to minimize the setback on the west side.

Member Bishop expressed concern for the proposed height of the building and the setback provided on the north. Mr. Heidy stated the building is setback 80 ft. from its second story to the houses on the north and setback 90 ft. from its third story.

Member Peters asked if it was possible to reduce portions of the second story roof. Mr. Heidy stated because of the nature and type of building there is an expectation for a ceiling height of 9 ft. He commented on the various heights used throughout the building to accommodate elevator access.

In response to a question from Chair Kraus, Mr. Heidy stated the open space in the front is public space.

Chair Kraus asked for a tree survey that shows the location of the trees being removed and those being planted. In addition, he inquired about the need for two parking spaces per unit. Mr. Kyte expressed his understanding the Zoning Code requires two spaces for multi-family units. He noted the extra parking space could be used for storage if not used for a vehicle.

In response to a question from Chair Kraus, Mr. Kyte stated the development will have covered parking and an enclosed trash receptacle and a fence along the rear perimeter of the property. Mr., Kyte expressed interest in providing additional landscaping.

Chair Kraus asked for additional information regarding the daylight plane impact, the proposed setbacks and the views of the existing conditions all around the site. He stated the PCZBA will look to further discuss having open space on the east along Evanston Avenue.

Member Bishop asked if the third story penthouses could be smaller so they are less visible. Mr. Kyte stated they have made an effort to minimize the third floor. Member Bishop encouraged them to continue exploring options to minimize the third floor impact.

Member Miller suggested the Petitioner explore creating a more transition housing concept on the east to better blend in with the beginning of the single-family neighborhood. Mr. Kyte stated the building is designed to appear as two buildings, but also as townhomes with the relief provided along the front and east/west sides of the building.

Member Miller expressed his interest in making the easterly portion of the building more like three individual single-family homes.

As there were no further comments from the PCZBA, Chair Kraus opened the floor for public comments.

Mr. Rick Lesser (resident) expressed concern for the project's conflict with the neighbors to the north and east. He stated the Petitioner is using planned development regulations as a means to avoid the Village's existing zoning which is a bad policy and something the PCZBA should avoid. Mr. Lesser stated the proposed development is in stark contrast to any other development in Lake Bluff. The Village has been and should be championed as a community with a hometown feel for families and children. Mr. Lesser stated he has experienced similar processes, specifically the Stonebridge Planned Development, and asked what The Roanoke Group has actually built. He stated the Village should want a builder with a proven track record. Mr. Lesser expressed concern for maintain the scale of the Village and stated he served on the Village Board when the Block One proposal was considered. He stated a third story was appropriate because there were no neighbors to impact. Mr. Lesser stated Block Three is a transitional area and whatever is built there should be something that will carry through with that transition. Lastly, Mr. Lesser asked the PCZBA to not recommend approval of the project.

Mr. Mark Stolzenberg (resident) showed pictures of the existing conditions of the site. He showed a sketch of the proposed development and then showed a sketch of the proposed building elevations in comparison to the existing PNC Bank elevations on Scranton and Oak Avenues. He commented on how the development would look from the backyards along North Avenue. Mr. Stolzenberg stated Planning Principles #3, #7 and #9 are relevant to this development. Mr. Stolzenberg stated he welcomes a development that is responsible and fits with the character of the community. He stated if we undertake the significant revision to the Zoning Code that this development requires this could greenlight other similar developments in other areas of the community.

Ms. Catherine Briand (resident) stated this development is not transitional and noted the type of development proposed belongs in Evanston or along Greenbay Road in Winnetka. She expressed concern for the change in use and the removal of the existing landscaping. Ms. Briand stated a developer that has no track record to speak of is not someone to be trusted. She stated this is a greenlight for developing Block Two in a similar manner. Ms. Briand added that there is no sufficient on-street parking for visitors.

Mr. Porter Vargas (resident) questioned the proposed PMD draft ordinance regarding the positive recommendation that is generated should the PCZBA not take action within 60 days. Village Attorney Friedman stated that may occur after the conclusion of the public hearing if the PCZBA took no action; however, the PCZBA would have to close the public hearing before the 60 day timeline starts. Additionally, Mr. Vargas expressed concern for having the regulations protect the Village in the event the Developer doesn't follow through with the development plans. Village Attorney Friedman stated if the Village approves a final PMD development plan there will be numerous protections built in the ordinance to ensure that if the developer is not able to complete the project, the property will be restored.

Ms. Robin McAfee (resident) stated she is appalled that the Village would consider circumventing the democratic process by allowing a special permit. She stated Lake Bluff is a two story town and she is worried the Village is accommodating a developer with the sole purpose of making a profit instead of looking out for the Village's well-being.

Ms. Ruth Schnell (resident) stated transitional housing could mean a combination of different things. She expressed her support for having condominiums near downtown and the library.

Ms. Marina Carney Puryear (resident) stated the Village is fortunate to have a CBD that is anchored by green space. The proposed plan is better than the previous plan, but the impact on the green space is more significant largely due to the loss of the 11 mature oak trees. She stated this is a precedent setting decision for downtown. She asked the PCZBA to consider the impact to the landscape and the need to strike a balance.

Ms. Christine Letchinger (resident) stated land use and zoning must evolve overtime. The Village has changed a great deal in the past 20 years and the Village's Advisory Boards have accomplished a lot in regards to land use. She stated this project is better than the previous project although it needs to be tweaked. She stated there is concern regarding financing and noted there are financial safeguards built-in the approval documents to ensure public improvements will be made. Ms. Letchinger stated this development will not set a precedence because every plan is considered separately and specific to the property. She stated the third story is not necessarily a bad thing depending on the design and that the Evanston Avenue side needs reviewed. Ms. Letchinger commented on past redevelopments and noted every time there is a proposal we have the same concerns for height, density, parking and traffic, yet the Village has managed to do various developments with the assistance of its advisory boards. She stated she wanted to give this perspective because it matters to take pause and consider this could work in the long run.

Mr. Thomas McAfee (resident) expressed concern for changing the zoning regulations for the downtown. He stated for the proposed Block Three development the Village is considering two new critical conditions for a text amendment from the Zoning Code to allow for a planned multi-use development and a special use permit. He stated these conditions by the PCZBA still do not change the existing underlying zoning for Block Three. He expressed his concern the use of the PMD conceals the numerous zoning variations that will be required by the Petitioner. Variations from the building height and impervious surface will be needed. He stated it is critical for all government agencies to maintain transparency with their actions and conduct. He stated the PMD is being used to disguise the magnitude of the required variations. Mr. McAfee stated it was inappropriate for the Village to remove the standard regarding impact to neighboring properties as this was included in the PCD ordinance, the basis for crating the PMD draft ordinance. Mr. McAfee expressed concern for the process is not transparent and there has been a lot of behind the scenes coordination with this project. Mr. McAfee stated the proposal has been thoughtful and the building is beautiful, but it's completely out of context with the community.

Mr. Robert Isham (resident) stated he is planning to transition to his home at 134 North Avenue but does not want to if the proposed development is approved. Mr. Isham stated he supports all the comments against this project. It is a very good looking project but it does not belong in Lake Bluff.

Mr. Paul Lemieux (resident) stated he supports the multi-family use for the property and is sensitive to the comments that it maybe not be transitional and it's too bulky, but the review process will address those elements. In terms of use he likes the multi-family use there and stated single-family housing on that block would not be useful because the prospect of six driveways coming out onto Scranton Avenue, as well as the removal of all the parking, would considerably change the character of the block. He stated the Village does not need townhouses and flats are a great idea and asked the Village to address the bulk.

Mr. Thomas Zarse (resident) stated it is a beautiful building but the wrong location for Lake Bluff. He commented on the proposed development for the former Children's Home in Lake Bluff and noted the Village made the right decision to maintain the character of the neighborhood by allowing single-family homes. He stated single-family houses on the east end of this lot is appropriate; it is currently zoned that way and should not be changed.

Ms. Holli Volkert (resident) asked the PCZBA to remember there are homes on North Avenue that actually face Oak Avenue. Ms. Volkert stated we have historic homes in the Village and it would be nice to be appreciated for preserving the historic homes in the downtown.

Mr. Kyle Petersen (resident) stated he is opposed to the zoning changes and the character of the community needs preserved. He stated Block One makes sense to be three stories because you have the densest buildings in the core of the urban area and then step down the intensity of uses as you move away from the urban core. He stated as you go down Scranton Avenue, Block One is three stories, then it steps down to two stories and then one before you get to Oak Avenue. To go back from a planning principle is not consistent and does not transition well with the existing neighborhood. Mr. Petersen stated the PCD on Block Two and Three are very similar and there is right to be concerned about what happens on Block Three occurring on Block Two. He stated the track record of the developer should also be considered.

Mr. Neal Geitner (resident) stated he attended the previous meeting with the last developer and commented on the feedback provided during the meeting. Mr. Geitner stated the size and scale does not offend him and asked that attempts be made to reach the broader Lake Bluff market to capture the opinion of those not in attendance at the meeting.

Mr. Jerry Kluchka (resident) stated he resides at the home that would look out at the building. He stated the developer has done a beautiful job designing the project but the project is too big for the space available. Mr. Kluchka stated he is not in favor of the project and asked if there is something else that can be done with the property on a smaller scale which can also be of benefit to the developer.

Ms. Karen Crotty (resident) stated the building looks like it belongs on Western Avenue in Lake Forest with the existing condominiums. She stated if we had more space that would be perfect because the building is beautiful, but out of scale for Lake Bluff.

As there were no further comments, Chair Kraus closed the public hearing.

Chair Kraus reviewed the options for action before the PCZBA and summarized the following request for additional information and action: i) an existing tree survey (showing species and quality of trees) and proposed landscape plan, as well as those trees being removed in reference to the Village's Tree Preservation Regulations; ii) a streetscape plan for Evanston Avenue addressing building façade and entire eastern configuration to create transition with the neighborhood to the east; iii) the buffer along the northern property line and encouraged the Petitioner to continue to work with the neighbors; iv) explore moving the development more to the west to provide greater setback along Evanston Avenue; v) explore further reducing the impact of the third floor; vi) provide a three dimensional model showing all angles around the property; vii) review the way the daylight plane regulation is being applied to the third story; viii) review and discuss the omission

of the standard from the PMD draft ordinance; and viii) discuss and review the specific standards in the PMD.

Member Badger expressed his preference to preserve open space adjacent to the CBD. He stated he likes the architectural features of the building and is not against having three stories, but would favor scaling back the project to preserve the open space. Member Badger asked the unit count to be reduced to condense the building and provide more of a transition from downtown to the residential district.

Member Peters expressed his concern for the density, height and scope of the project. The proposal is architecturally attractive and asked if the Village is ready for a structure that has a perception of being that large on that block.

Member Miller stated it is not worth moving forward without significant changes to the proposal that will ensure the developer works within the planning principles. Member Miller stated this is not transitional housing, but two large apartment buildings in a residential neighborhood. He noted he is opposed to the development of PMD regulations. He stated the developer is not listening to the Village or the community and he should apply the planning principles when considering this project.

Member Collins stated residents endure high property taxes to live in Lake Bluff which is a very unique small scale Village. She stated there may be some appeal amongst Village leadership that this is somehow going to help the tax base and expressed her belief it could negatively impact the tax base because the Village would no longer be unique. She read paragraph 10-6a-11 of the CBD Zoning Code regarding design standards and guidelines. Member Collins stated she has been supportive of changes in the past, but this is quite different because this is a big change to the character of the Village as it will no longer feel like the small town we all love. She stated it is possible to do multi-family that meets a smaller scale and actually works. Member Collins stated she is not against development or multi-family residential, but would like projects that have a small town intimate feel.

Chair Kraus stated the PCZBA typically prefers to allow time for the Petitioner to make changes to the proposal and respond to comments stated during the meeting.

Chair Kraus continued the public hearing to the July 20, 2016 PCZBA meeting.

4. A Public Hearing to Consider: i) a Variation From the E-1 Residence District Minimum Lot Width Requirements of Section 10-5B-4 of the Zoning Code; ii) a Variation From the Lot Frontage Requirements of Section 10-5-1 of the Zoning Code; and iii) Any Other Zoning Relief as Required to Build a New House on the Property Located at 515 Cambridge Lane

Chair Kraus introduced the agenda item and then requested an update from Staff.

A to VA Stanick stated that provided in the Informational Updates received by the PCZBA prior to the meeting is a description of an additional variation which emerged out of having received an updated final plat of subdivision. This additional variation is regarding the accessory structure setback requirements for the existing accessory structure on the proposed new lot. He stated there were also some documents that were provided relating to the history of the subdivision and the intent that this lot be buildable.

A to VA Stanick provided a brief history of the property and reviewed the zoning relief needed for the proposal to subdivide 515 Cambridge Lane. A to VA Stanick stated the PCZBA is not considering a subdivision of this lot because it is only creating one additional lot, which given the requested variations, should those be granting approval by the Village Board, would create a lot that complies with the Zoning Code and be exempt for the Village's Tentative Plat Subdivision Regulations. A discussion followed.

A to VA Stanick stated the Petitioners are requesting: i) a 76% variation from the minimum lot frontage requirements of 150 ft. to permit a lot frontage of 35.92 ft. for parcel 1 of Lot 8 (vacant parcel); ii) an 18% variation from the minimum lot width requirements of 150 ft. to permit a lot width of 123 ft. for parcel 1 of Lot 8; and iii) a 64% variation from the E-1 District minimum accessory structure setback requirements of 15 ft. to allow an existing accessory structure (approximately 23 ft. in height) to encroach in the required side yard setback by 9.55 ft. In addition, after confirming the Petitioners would like to keep the accessory structure, the PCZBA will also consider a variation to permit the existing accessory structure located on parcel 1 of Lot 8 to remain without a principal structure.

A to VA Stanick presented a map of the property and showed the lot proposed for subdivision and provided a brief history of the property.

Chair Kraus administered the oath to those in attendance and opened the public hearing.

Mr. Christopher Burke (Petitioner) stated he is the contract purchaser of the property and the plan is to build a new single-family home. He provided background information regarding homes he has built in Lake Bluff. Mr. Burke reviewed his request for zoning relief. He noted the variations being sought are in response to the changes to the Zoning Code since the property was originally subdivide in the late 1970s.

As there were no comments from the PCZBA, Chair Kraus closed the public hearing.

Member Badger moved to recommend the Village Board approve the following zoning relief to allow a one-lot subdivision of the property at 515 Cambridge Lane: i) a 76% variation from the minimum lot frontage requirements of 150 ft. to permit a lot frontage of 35.92 ft. for parcel 1 of Lot 8 (vacant parcel); ii) an 18% variation from the minimum lot width requirements of 150 ft. to permit a lot width of 123 ft. for parcel 1 of Lot 8; iii) a 64% variation from the E-1 District minimum accessory structure setback requirements of 15 ft. to allow an existing accessory structure (approximately 23 ft. in height) to encroach in the required side yard setback by 9.55 ft.; and iv) a variation to permit the existing accessory structure located on parcel 1 of Lot 8 to remain without a principal structure. Member Bishop seconded the motion. The motion passed on the following roll call vote:

Ayes: (7) Badger, Bishop, Burns, Collins, Miller, Peters and Chair Kraus
Nays: (0)
Absent: (0)

5. A Public Hearing to Consider the Following: i) a Text Amendment to the Village’s Zoning Regulations to Allow the Construction, Operation and Maintenance of Electric Incline Tram Lift Systems on Bluffs as a Permitted or Special Use in Residential Zoning Districts; ii) a Special Use Permit to Allow the Construction, Operation and Maintenance of an Electric Incline Tram Lift System on the Bluff Located at 611 Lansdowne Lane; and iii) Any Other Zoning Relief as Required

Chair Kraus introduced the agenda item and then requested an update from Staff.

A to VA Stanick stated the Petitioner is seeking to amend the Lake Bluff Zoning Code regarding bluff and ravine regulations that prohibit the construction of an accessory structure in any bluff or ravine. The Petitioner recently sought and was granted zoning relief by the Village to construct a new pool house (with light, heat and bathing facilities) which is being built at the same time as their new residence on Lot 5 in the Lansdowne Subdivision; at this time, they are proposing to install an electric lift system (with necessary landings) to provide access from the top of the bluff to the bottom for access to the shoreline and water via a Special Use Permit or as of right.

Chair Kraus noted the PCZBA needs to consider whether the proposed use would be allowed as of right or by a special use permit.

Chair Kraus administered the oath to those in attendance and opened the public hearing.

In response to a comment from Chair Kraus, Mr. Jeffrey Tondola, contractor representing the Petitioner, stated currently there are no plans to replace the existing stairs.

A discussion regarding allowing stairs in addition to trams followed. Interest was expressed among the Members of the PCZBA to only allow one tram per property and require the tram to undergo an annual inspection. It was also the consensus of the PCZBA to allow this use as a special use.

As there were no further comments, Chair Kraus closed the public hearing

Member Collins moved to recommend the Village Board approve a text amendment to the Zoning Code to allow the construction, operation and maintenance of electric incline tram lift systems on bluffs as a special use on lakefront properties limited to one tram to the beach per property and require annual inspections. Member Miller seconded the motion. The motion passed on the following roll call vote:

Ayes: (7) Bishop, Burns, Collins, Miller, Peters, Badger and Chair Kraus
Nays: (0)
Absent: (0)

Member Collins moved to recommend the Village Board approve a special use permit to allow the operation of an electric incline tram lift system on the bluff at 611 Lansdowne Lane. Member Bishop seconded the motion. The motion passed on the following roll call vote:

Ayes: (7) Burns, Collins, Miller, Peters, Badger, Bishop and Chair Kraus
Nays: (0)
Absent: (0)

6. **A Public Hearing (continued to July 20, 2016) to Consider the Following: i) a Variation From the R-3 Residence District, Minimum Front Yard Setback Regulations of Section 10-5-3 of the Zoning Code; ii) a Variation From the Required Front Yard Setback Impervious Surface Limitation Regulations of Section 10-5-7 of the Zoning Code; and iii) Any Other Zoning Relief as Required to Construct an Attached Garage by Enclosing the Existing Car Port Located at 225 W. Center Avenue**

7. **Commissioner's Report**

Chair Kraus reported the next regular PCZBA meeting is scheduled for July 20, 2016.

8. **Staff's Report**

A to VA Stanick had no report.

9. **Adjournment**

As there was no further business to come before the PCZBA, Member Collins moved to adjourn the meeting. Member Miller seconded the motion. The meeting adjourned at 10:52 p.m.

Respectfully submitted,

Brandon Stanick
Assistant to the Village Administrator